

SYMMETRIZED PQMC STUDIES OF THE GROUND STATE OF C_{60} ¹

Bhargavi Srinivasan³, S. Ramasesha^{3,5} and H. R. Krishnamurthy^{4,5}²

³*Solid State and Structural Chemistry Unit
Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560 012, India*

⁴*Department of Physics
Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560 012, India*

⁵*Jawaharlal Nehru Centre for Advanced Scientific Research
Jakkur Campus, Bangalore 560 064, India*

¹Contribution no. 1169 from the Solid State and Structural Chemistry Unit

²e-mail: bhargavi@sscu.iisc.ernet.in, ramasesh@sscu.iisc.ernet.in,
hrkrish@physics.iisc.ernet.in

Abstract

We develop a new *symmetrized* version of the Projector Quantum Monte Carlo (SPQMC) method which preserves the symmetries of the system by simultaneously sampling all symmetry related Ising configurations at each MC step and use it to study the effect of electron correlations on a single C_{60} molecule and its structural motifs, within the Hubbard model. Thi SPQMC method allows more accurate estimates of correlation functions as seen from calculations on small systems. The method applied to some molecular fragments of C_{60} , viz, pyracylene, fluoranthene and corannulene, gives a good chemical description of these systems. Analysis of the ground state bond orders allows us to visualize pyracylene as a naphthalene moiety with weakly bridged ethylenic units, fluoranthene as weakly bridged naphthalene and benzene units, and corannulene as radialene with ethylenic bridges. We study the ground state properties of a single fullerene molecule, with and without bond alternation. The bond orders in the ground state for the two types of nearest neighbour bonds are unequal, even for uniform C_{60} . The spin and charge correlations give a consistent picture of the interacting ground state in all these systems. We construct projections of the bond orders and spin-spin correlation functions on the space of irreducible representations of the icosahedral point group. These projections, analogous to the structure factors of translationally invariant systems, give the amplitudes for distortions which transform as the irreducible representations of the point group. The amplitude for the H_g distortion is the largest while

the spin structure has large weights in the T_{2g} and G_u representations.

1 Introduction

The fascinating and esoteric phenomena exhibited by systems containing the fullerene, C_{60} [1, 2], have attracted the attention of experimentalists and theorists in both physics and chemistry. Pure C_{60} in the solid state exhibits interesting plastic crystal transformations[3]. Alkali doped compounds of C_{60} are superconducting, with $Rb_{1.5}Cs_{1.5}C_{60}$ having the highest known superconducting transition temperature for organic systems ($T_c = 32K$)[4]. The donor-acceptor compound, C_{60} - $TDAE$ ($TDAE$ = tetrakis dimethyl amino ethylene) is one of the few known purely organic ferromagnets, with a Curie temperature of 16.5K, the highest known for an organic system[5, 6].

Despite intense efforts at understanding the diverse electronic phenomena in C_{60} systems, a reliable correlated electronic structure for the ground state of even an isolated C_{60} molecule still remains elusive. A perturbation theoretic (PT) calculation in the framework of the Hubbard and modified Hubbard models[7, 8] focuses on the energies of the low-lying states of doped C_{60} . The main concern of this study is the sign of the low-spin high-spin energy gap as a function of the model parameters. This problem has also been studied by the Variational Monte Carlo (VMC) method[9] using a Gutzwiller type variational wavefunction[10]. The large U limit of the Hubbard model on a single fullerene molecule leads to a frustrated, antiferromagnetically interacting $s = 1/2$ Heisenberg spin model. The classical ground state (large s limit) has been determined[11]. Using a spin-wave analysis around the classical ground

state, the possibility of a magnetic instability in the ground state at a critical value U_c of the Hubbard parameter has been conjectured[12].

In recent years, there have been some reports of calculations of the ground state of C_{60} using conventional quantum chemical techniques. One of these employs an $STO - 3G^*$ basis in the Hartree-Fock procedure and follows this up with a limited configuration interaction (CI) procedure[13]. Another calculation employs the Modified Neglect of Differential Overlap (MNDO) procedure[14] while yet another the Linearized Muffin Tin Orbital (LMTO) method[15]. Even at the level of a single fullerene molecule, conventional quantum chemical techniques for obtaining the correlated electronic structure are inadequate. Besides being basis set dependent, these approximations are known to be uncontrolled due to arbitrary truncation of the CI procedure. Thus, such calculations fail to isolate the role of the active p_π -type orbital in determining the properties of fullerene. Given these difficulties encountered in quantum chemical approaches, what is essential to understanding the properties of C_{60} is a thorough study of well defined model hamiltonians. Such studies allow us to follow the evolution of the electronic states as a function of model parameters, thereby providing valuable insights.

The solution of model hamiltonians can also be undertaken within the framework of quantum chemical techniques, but even here, the astronomically large dimensionality of the full many body space corresponding to the half filled (or nearly half filled) p_π -like orbitals cannot be dealt with reasonably. However, exact calculations are possible on chemically feasible fragments of

C_{60} and these studies would provide the necessary calibration for any novel approximate technique[16, 17].

Amongst recent many body techniques for solving interacting model hamiltonians, Quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) methods and the density matrix renormalization group (DMRG) method[18] have come to the fore. The DMRG method is accurate mainly for one-dimensional lattices. There are many variations of the QMC method. While the VMC method[19] provides an estimate of expectation values of the Hubbard Hamiltonian in the Gutzwiller trial function, the temperature QMC methods[20] extrapolate ground state properties from finite temperature properties. A Quantum Monte Carlo procedure that directly estimates the ground state properties of Hubbard type models is the Projector Quantum Monte Carlo (PQMC) method[21]. In this method the ground state is projected from a non-interacting trial wavefunction such as a Slater Determinant in the Huckel Molecular Orbital (MO) basis. Also, the PQMC method does not suffer from either the limitations of the structure imposed by a trial wavefunction, as in the VMC method, or the necessity of extrapolating the ground state from finite temperature results, as in the temperature Monte Carlo methods (which suffer from numerical difficulties at very low temperatures)[22].

In this article, we report results of the first PQMC studies of the ground state of an isolated fullerene molecule. We have greatly enhanced the accuracy of the Monte Carlo sampling by exploiting the symmetries of the system. From comparison of exact results with symmetrized PQMC results for small clusters,

we find that incorporating symmetries leads to a marked improvement in the correlation functions, thus providing us a more reliable picture of the correlated ground state of C_{60} .

This article is organized as follows. In the next section we describe the Projector Quantum Monte Carlo method for the Hubbard model. In section 3, we introduce the symmetrized PQMC (SPQMC) method and compare results for small systems with results obtained from exact calculations and the VMC method. Section 4 pertains to our results on the ground state properties of C_{60} and its molecular fragments and discussion of the data. Section 5 is a summary of the work presented in this paper.

2 The PQMC Method

The Monte Carlo algorithm to project out the ground state from a trial wavefunction was first introduced by Sorella *et al*[21]. While their method used a fast Fourier transform (FFT) technique for propagating the single-particle states and Langevin dynamics to sample the distribution, Imada and Hatsugai[23] introduced an algorithm that runs parallel to the temperature QMC, which we employ in our calculations.

The single band Hubbard Hamiltonian, $\hat{H}$ may be written as a sum of a non-interacting part, $\hat{H}_0$ and an interaction part, $\hat{H}_1$, given by[24],

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}_1 \tag{1}$$

$$\hat{H}_0 = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \sum_{\sigma} t_{ij} (c_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j\sigma} + h.c.) \tag{2}$$

$$\hat{H}_1 = U \sum_i \hat{n}_{i\uparrow} \hat{n}_{i\downarrow} \quad (3)$$

where $c_{i\sigma}^\dagger$ ($c_{i\sigma}$) is the creation(annihilation) operator for an electron with spin σ in the Wannier orbital at the i^{th} site, $\hat{n}_{i\sigma}$ are the corresponding number operators and the summation is over bonded atom pairs.

The ground state, $|\psi_0\rangle$ of a Hamiltonian, $\hat{H}$ can be projected from a trial wavefunction $|\phi\rangle$ by the *ansatz*

$$|\psi_0\rangle = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{-\beta \hat{H}} |\phi\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle \phi | e^{-2\beta \hat{H}} | \phi \rangle}} \quad (4)$$

provided $|\phi\rangle$ has a nonzero projection on to $|\psi_0\rangle$. The trial wavefunction $|\phi\rangle$ is usually formed from the MOs generated by diagonalizing the non-interacting problem. The trial state with M -fermions, in second-quantization is represented as

$$|\phi_\sigma\rangle = \prod_{m=1}^M \left(\sum_{i=1}^N (\Phi_\sigma)_{im} \hat{c}_{i\sigma}^\dagger \right) |0\rangle \quad (5)$$

where Φ_σ is an $N \times M$ matrix of the MO coefficients whose row index, i , corresponds to the site number and column index, m , corresponds to the m^{th} MO occupied by an electron of spin σ , in the trial wavefunction.

To carry out the projection for an interacting Hamiltonian, it is necessary to Trotter decompose the density operator $\exp(-\beta \hat{H})$ as

$$e^{-\beta \hat{H}} = \left(e^{-\Delta\tau \hat{H}} \right)^L \quad (6)$$

$$e^{-\Delta\tau \hat{H}} = e^{-\Delta\tau/2 \hat{H}_0} e^{-\Delta\tau \hat{H}_1} e^{-\Delta\tau/2 \hat{H}_0} \quad (7)$$

where $\beta = L \times \Delta\tau$. The error introduced in this decomposition due to non-commutativity of $\hat{H}_0$ and $\hat{H}_1$ is of order $(\Delta\tau)^3$. The matrix representation, $\mathbf{b}_0$,

of $\exp(-\Delta\tau/2\hat{H}_0)$ can be easily obtained in the basis of Wannier functions as

$$\mathbf{b}_0 = \exp[-\mathbf{K}] \quad (8)$$

$$K_{ij} = \begin{cases} -\frac{\Delta\tau}{2}t_{ij}, & \text{for } i, j \text{ bonded sites;} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

However, the interaction part cannot be represented as a matrix in the one-particle basis. This makes it necessary to obtain a one-particle like description of $\exp(\Delta\tau\hat{H}_1)$, which is indeed possible via a discrete Hubbard-Stratanovich (H-S) transformation at every time slice. At the l^{th} time slice, the H-S transformation gives

$$e^{-\Delta\tau\hat{H}_1(l)} = \sum_{s_{1l}=\pm 1} \sum_{s_{2l}=\pm 1} \dots \sum_{s_{Nl}=\pm 1} e^{-\Delta\tau\hat{H}_{1\uparrow}(l, \mathbf{s}_l)} e^{-\Delta\tau\hat{H}_{1\downarrow}(l, \mathbf{s}_l)} \quad (10)$$

$$e^{-\Delta\tau\hat{H}_{1\uparrow}(l, \mathbf{s}_l)} = \prod_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{2} \exp(\lambda s_{il} \hat{n}_{i\uparrow} - \Delta\tau \frac{U}{2} \hat{n}_{i\uparrow}) \right) \quad (11)$$

$$e^{-\Delta\tau\hat{H}_{1\downarrow}(l, \mathbf{s}_l)} = \prod_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{2} \exp(-\lambda s_{il} \hat{n}_{i\downarrow} - \Delta\tau \frac{U}{2} \hat{n}_{i\downarrow}) \right) \quad (12)$$

where

$$\lambda = 2 \operatorname{arctanh} \sqrt{\tanh(\Delta\tau U/4)}, \quad (13)$$

s_{il} is the Hubbard-Stratanovich field at the i^{th} site in the l^{th} time slice and $\mathbf{s}_l$ is an N -vector whose i^{th} component corresponds to the Ising variable s_{il} . Now it becomes possible to obtain a matrix representation, $\mathbf{b}_{1\sigma}(l, \mathbf{s}_l)$, of $\exp(-\Delta\tau H_{1\sigma}(l, \mathbf{s}_l))$ in the basis of Wannier functions,

$$(\mathbf{b}_{1\uparrow}(l, \mathbf{s}_l))_{ij} = \delta_{ij} \frac{1}{2} \exp[\lambda s_{il} - \frac{\Delta\tau}{2}] \quad (14)$$

$$(\mathbf{b}_{1\downarrow}(l, \mathbf{s}_l))_{ij} = \delta_{ij} \frac{1}{2} \exp[-\lambda s_{il} - \frac{\Delta\tau}{2}]. \quad (15)$$

This gives us the matrix representation, $\mathbf{B}_\sigma(l, \mathbf{s}_l)$, for $\exp(-\Delta\tau \hat{H}_\sigma)$ at the l^{th} time slice,

$$\mathbf{B}_\sigma(l, \mathbf{s}_l) = \mathbf{b}_0 \mathbf{b}_{1\sigma}(l, \mathbf{s}_l) \mathbf{b}_0 \quad (16)$$

The Trotter decomposition followed by the H-S transformation thus results in the replacement of the interacting Hamiltonian by a sum of $2^{N \times L}$ noninteracting Hamiltonians corresponding to each configuration of the $(d+1)$ -dimensional $N \times L$ Ising lattice. The properties of the interacting Hamiltonian are simple averages taken over the corresponding properties of all the $2^{N \times L}$ noninteracting Hamiltonians. The matrix representation of the projection operator for the interacting Hamiltonian can now be written as a sum of individual projections, $\mathbf{P}(\{s\})$, each corresponding to the non-interacting Hamiltonian for the Ising configuration $\{s\}$. The matrix $\mathbf{P}(\{s\})$ is given by,

$$\mathbf{P}(\{s\}) = \mathbf{P}_\uparrow(\{s\}) \mathbf{P}_\downarrow(\{s\}) \quad (17)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_\sigma(\{s\}) = \mathbf{B}_\sigma(1, \mathbf{s}_1) \mathbf{B}_\sigma(2, \mathbf{s}_2) \dots \mathbf{B}_\sigma(L, \mathbf{s}_L) \quad (18)$$

This allows the representation of the expectation value, w , of the density operator $\exp(-\beta \hat{H})$, in the trial state $|\phi\rangle$, namely,

$$w = \langle \phi | e^{-\beta \hat{H}} | \phi \rangle \quad (19)$$

which takes the form

$$w = \langle \phi | \sum_{\{s\}} \mathbf{P}(\{s\}) | \phi \rangle \quad (20)$$

within Trotter error. It is convenient to define weights for each Ising configuration $\{s\}$ as

$$W(\{s\}) = W_{\uparrow}(\{s\})W_{\downarrow}(\{s\}) \quad (21)$$

$$W_{\sigma}(\{s\}) = \det\left(\Phi_{\sigma}^T \mathbf{B}_{\sigma}(1, \mathbf{s}_1) \mathbf{B}_{\sigma}(2, \mathbf{s}_2) \dots \mathbf{B}_{\sigma}(L, \mathbf{s}_L) \Phi_{\sigma}\right) \quad (22)$$

w can now be conveniently expressed as a sum over weights of all Ising configurations,

$$w = \sum_{\{s\}} W(\{s\}). \quad (23)$$

For large N and L , it is computationally prohibitive to obtain properties as exact averages over all Ising configurations. A simple average based on crude sampling would lead to large errors in the estimates. However, by resorting to importance sampling of the Ising configurations, it is possible to obtain estimates with acceptable errors. A straightforward importance sampling of the Ising configurations assumes that an Ising configuration $\{s\}$ appears with probability

$$\pi(\{s\}) = \frac{W(\{s\})}{w} \quad (24)$$

However, computing w is equivalent to obtaining the ground state projection for the given β . This vicious circle is broken by employing an ergodic Markov chain.

The state space of the Markov chain is taken to be the space of Ising configurations and the initial Ising configuration is chosen assuming a uniform probability distribution in the configuration space. The one-step transition probabilities between any two Ising configurations $\{s\}$ and $\{s'\}$ is so chosen

that the ratio of the limiting probabilities of the configurations tends to $\frac{\pi(\{s'\})}{\pi(\{s\})}$.

The one-step transition probability

$$p_{\{s\} \rightarrow \{s'\}} = \frac{r}{1+r} \quad (25)$$

$$r = \frac{W(\{s'\})}{W(\{s\})} \quad (26)$$

gives the correct limiting ratios for the probabilities of Ising configurations. The Monte Carlo simulation now follows the usual procedure. The new Ising configurations can be generated either by the cluster spin-flip or the single spin-flip mechanisms. For convenience we employ sequential spin flips exhausting all sites in a given time slice before moving over to the next time slice.

In the Monte Carlo procedure, we estimate the equal time Green function $G_\sigma(l, \{s\})$, which we regard as a matrix in the Wannier basis, for spin σ , at the l^{th} time slice, for every configuration $\{s\}$ which is sampled. The $(j, k)^{th}$ matrix element of $G_\sigma(l, \{s\})$ is given by

$$(G_\sigma(l, \{s\}))_{jk} = \frac{\langle L_\sigma(l, \{s\}) \hat{c}_{k\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\sigma} | R_\sigma(l, \{s\}) \rangle}{\langle L_\sigma(l, \{s\}) | R_\sigma(l, \{s\}) \rangle} \quad (27)$$

where the the projected states $\langle L_\sigma(l, \{s\}) |$ and $| R_\sigma(l, \{s\}) \rangle$ are obtained analogous to $|\phi\rangle$ in eqn. (5) using the coefficient matrices $\mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{R}$,

$$\mathbf{L}_\sigma(l, \{s\}) = \Phi_\sigma^T \mathbf{B}_\sigma(1, \mathbf{s}_1) \mathbf{B}_\sigma(2, \mathbf{s}_2) \dots \mathbf{B}_\sigma(l-1, \mathbf{s}_{l-1}) \mathbf{b}_0 \quad (28)$$

$$\mathbf{R}_\sigma(l, \{s\}) = \mathbf{b}_{1\sigma}(l, \mathbf{s}_l) \mathbf{b}_0 \mathbf{B}_\sigma(l+1, \mathbf{s}_{l+1}) \mathbf{B}_\sigma(l+2, \mathbf{s}_{l+2}) \dots \mathbf{B}_\sigma(L, \mathbf{s}_L) \Phi_\sigma. \quad (29)$$

In practice, this involves obtaining the inverse of a matrix. For the single spin flip mechanism, efficient algorithms exist to obtain the ratio, r , of the determinants and to update the Green function if the spin flip is accepted[23, 25].

However, the updated inverse degrades fairly rapidly and the Green function will have to be recomputed from scratch every few hundred spin flips. Properties of the Hamiltonian can be evaluated from Monte Carlo estimates of the equal time Green function $\langle\langle G \rangle\rangle$

$$\langle\langle G_\sigma \rangle\rangle_{ij} = \frac{1}{N_s L N} \sum_{l, \{s\}} (G_\sigma(l, \{s\}))_{ij}. \quad (30)$$

where N_s is the number of MC sweeps over the Ising lattice, after equilibration. We employ Wick's theorem to compute two particle properties from the single-particle Green function, $(G_\sigma(l, \{s\}))_{ij}$, at every time slice, l .

3 Symmetrized PQMC Method

A serious drawback of Monte Carlo simulations carried out as described in the previous section is that the Green function and correlation functions do not reflect the symmetries of the system. This is because the noninteracting Hamiltonian corresponding to an Ising configuration does not have the full symmetry of the system. In the MC sampling each Ising configuration is dealt with independently. Thus, when a particular Ising configuration is visited in the course of sampling, it is not guaranteed that all the other Ising configurations related by symmetry are also visited. For example, while we may sample the configuration in fig. 1a, it is not certain that the configuration in fig. 1b, which is related by C_4 symmetry is also sampled during the simulation. For this reason, the MC sampling breaks the symmetry of the Hamiltonian. The full symmetry of the Hamiltonian can be preserved if we ensure that for every

Ising configuration that is sampled, all its symmetry related partners are also tacitly included in the sampling.

The symmetry of the Hamiltonian guarantees that the one-step transition probability between Ising configurations $\{s\}$, $\{s'\}$ is the same as that between $\hat{R}\{s\}$ and $\hat{R}\{s'\}$, where $\hat{R}$ is a symmetry element of the Schrodinger group of the Hamiltonian,

$$p_{\{s\} \rightarrow \{s'\}} = p_{\hat{R}\{s\} \rightarrow \hat{R}\{s'\}} \quad (31)$$

Therefore, if an Ising configuration $\{s'\}$ is accepted (rejected) from an initial configuration $\{s\}$, the same result is expected from all symmetry related pairs of configurations $\hat{R}\{s'\}$ and $\hat{R}\{s\}$. This feature can be incorporated by constructing a symmetrized Green function as follows:

$$G_{ij}^{sym}(\{s\}) = \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\hat{R}} G_{ij}(\hat{R}\{s\}) \quad (32)$$

and $\hat{R}$ runs over all the h symmetry elements of the group.

It appears from the equation that we need to update the Green functions $G(\hat{R}\{s\})$ for every symmetry operation $\hat{R}$, which could be enormously compute intensive. However, the Green functions $G(\hat{R}\{s\})$ and $G(\{s\})$ are related as

$$G_{ij}(\{s'\}) = G_{i'j'}(\{s\}) \quad (33)$$

$$\hat{R} : \{s\} \rightarrow \{s'\}; \quad (34)$$

$$\hat{R}^{-1} : i \rightarrow i' ; \quad \hat{R}^{-1} : j \rightarrow j' \quad (35)$$

Thus, from the Green function of a single Ising configuration, we can generate the Green functions of all Ising configurations related by the symmetry group of the system.

In highly symmetric systems such as C_{60} , the number of symmetry elements, h , of the Schrodinger group can be very large. For instance, the number of symmetry elements in the icosahedral group is 120 and the number of pairs of sites is $O(N^2)$, which, for C_{60} is 3600. In a symmetrized sampling procedure, for C_{60} , it appears that we should average all the 3600 elements of the single particle Green function over the 120 symmetry related Ising configurations. This procedure turns out to be prohibitive, computationally. However, we recognise that there are only 24 unique pairs of carbon atoms on the fullerene molecule. It is sufficient to average these 24 pairs of matrix elements of the Green function over all the symmetry related Ising configurations, to obtain the complete symmetrized Green function. This reduces the cpu requirement, in the case of C_{60} by a factor of 150, thus rendering the SPQMC procedure computationally feasible for large systems.

The PQMC method in its current implementation is not variational. A variational implementation of the PQMC procedure can, in principle, be achieved by projecting the states $\langle L_\sigma(l, \{s\}) |$ and $| R_\sigma(l, \{s\}) \rangle$ from identical Ising configurations. The Green function is sampled only at the middle time slice. This ensures that the estimated quantity is an expectation value of a projected trial state. However, this version of PQMC would have larger errors for the same β due to halving of the Ising lattice.

We have tested the SPQMC procedure for the simple case of a Hubbard ring of six sites since this is easily amenable to exact studies. In table 1, we compare the SPQMC ground state energies for different values of the Hubbard parameter, U/t , with the results of exact and VMC calculations. It is not surprising that in terms of energy, the VMC results are better than the PQMC results for very small U ($\approx 0.5t$), since the Gutzwiller trial function is the true ground state for $U/t = 0.0$. However, for larger values of U/t , the percentage errors in PQMC estimates of the ground state energy are smaller than in the VMC estimates. The most striking difference, however, is seen in two-particle correlation functions like the spin-spin and charge-charge correlations. The results presented in tables 2a and 2b show clearly that the SPQMC results are accurate even for $U = 4.0t$. Thus, the SPQMC method allows a better understanding of the correlated ground state of C_{60} .

Symmetrized sampling can also be used to estimate properties of excited states. This is possible since the projection operator projects the lowest energy state in a chosen symmetry subspace of the Hamiltonian. We could start with an initial state that transforms as the basis of an irreducible representation of the desired space, usually an appropriate linear combination of Slater Determinants obtained from group theoretic projection operators. In the symmetrized sampling procedure, the symmetry of the Hamiltonian is explicitly preserved. This prevents any admixture of states from different symmetry spaces thereby leading to the lowest energy state of the subspace. When the starting state is a linear combination of Slater Determinants, estimates of properties require

modifications to the PQMC procedure as will be discussed elsewhere[26].

For simple cases with non-degenerate LUMOs, such as Hubbard chains the properties of the ground state of the doped system can be obtained from a single determinantal PQMC with symmetrized sampling, as verified for small systems[26]. The doped states of molecules with degenerate LUMOs are rather difficult to handle. To estimate the ground state properties of such systems, with open shell electronic configurations, it is necessary to carry out a multi-determinantal, symmetrized PQMC simulation. This is true for even as simple a system as doped benzene. There is considerable interest in the electronic structure of doped C_{60} species. Unfortunately, the threefold degeneracy of the LUMOs of C_{60} makes a single determinantal calculation feasible only for C_{60}^{6-} and the high spin state of C_{60}^{3-} . We are currently implementing a multideterminantal, symmetrized PQMC method for studying doped C_{60} species.

4 Results on the Ground State of C_{60} and its Fragments

In this section we present results on the ground state of C_{60} and its fragments, obtained via SPQMC calculations. We compare these with VMC results and also with exact results, wherever possible[17, 27]. In Section (4.1) we discuss the nature of the correlated ground state in the molecules pyracylene, fluoranthene and corannulene (fig. 2). These molecules have been chosen because they represent the characteristic chemical motifs of C_{60} and contain one or more five-membered rings essential for displaying the minimal topological features

of C_{60} . The trends observed in these systems are expected to be indicative of the behaviour of the full molecule. In Section 4.2 we present SPQMC results on both uniform and bond-alternated C_{60} for various values of U/t . These results include energies, bond orders, charge and spin correlations. We compare these results with the VMC results.

4.1 Fragments of C_{60}

In table 3 we present the ground state energies of the fragments, pyracylene, fluoranthene and corannulene for different values of U/t . The pyracylene molecule is the smallest characteristic fragment of C_{60} that we have studied. It is also amenable to exact calculations. The ground state energy obtained from the SPQMC calculations compares favourably with that from the exact calculation for $U/t = 1.0$. We also compare our SPQMC results with the VMC results for all values of U/t , for all fragments. The agreement is very good with VMC for small values of U/t and tends to deteriorate for larger values of the Hubbard parameter. The SPQMC results are more reliable than the corresponding VMC results, for similar sample sizes. For, the SPQMC estimates are exact within Trotter error (which in our case is $O(10^{-3})$). In contrast, the VMC estimates are also limited by the choice of the trial wavefunction and it has been shown that the Gutzwiller function, with a single variational parameter, is a poor trial function at large U/t [28].

The bond orders in pyracylene, fluoranthene and corannulene decrease with increasing U/t , which is consistent with increased covalency of the ground

state. A detailed analysis of the bond order data allows one to visualize these molecules in terms of interconnected chemical motifs. We can describe pyracylene as a naphthalene moiety weakly coupled to two ethylene moities. Fluoranthene can be visualized as a naphthalene motif which is weakly linked to a benzene unit. And corannulene can be viewed as ethylene bridges connecting the spokes of the radialene molecule.

The spin correlations of the nearest neighbours in these molecules lend support to the picture emerging from the bond order data. The strong bonds also have large antiferromagnetic (*afm*) correlations. Thus, the strongest bond (1-2 bond) in pyracylene also has the largest *afm* spin-spin correlation. In fluoranthene, the bridging bond (4-5 bond) has a spin-spin correlation which is less than a third of that of the strongest bond (7-8 bond). The bonds along the perimeter of corannulene fall into two distinct classes, a trend expected from the bond order variations. What is more interesting are the bonds of the radialene motif (fig. 3), all of which have reasonably large *afm* correlations. However the spokes have larger correlations than the bonds of the pentagon. Thus we see that the pentagon in corannulene is already in a chemical environment similar to that of C_{60} . Frustration due to the five membered ring is thus manifest in a qualitatively different way, in this molecule.

The charge correlations of the bonds in pyracylene, fluoranthene and corannulene increase with increasing U/t , while the on-site (diagonal) charge correlations decrease with increasing U/t , a feature expected of the Hubbard model. In the large U/t limit, the intersite charge correlations approach unity.

The magnitude of the charge correlations can be related to the total oscillator strength of the molecule for dipole transitions[29]. This evidently decreases with increase in the strength of electron correlations. The diagonal charge correlations in the noninteracting limit have a value of 1.5 while in the strongly interacting case, this value is 1.0. However, depending upon the topology of the bond connectivities, the interactions lead to values of the diagonal charge correlations in the range 0–2. The picture as obtained from charge correlations computed using the SPQMC method corresponds to a more uniform distribution of charges than that obtained from the VMC calculations.

4.2 SPQMC Ground State Properties of C_{60}

We have computed the ground state properties of an isolated fullerene molecule using the SPQMC method. We have studied uniform fullerene (equal hexagon-hexagon (h-h) and hexagon-pentagon (h-p) transfer integrals) as well as bond alternated fullerene (h-h transfer integral larger in magnitude than the h-p transfer integral). In the latter, the h-h and h-p bonds were taken to have transfer matrix elements t_{h-h} and t_{h-p} equal to 1.2 and 0.9 respectively, so that the sum of the transfer integrals remains unchanged after introducing alternation. This ratio, which is slightly larger than the experimental value, was chosen to magnify the effects of bond alternation and is not expected to change the properties qualitatively. We have carried out the simulations with $\Delta\tau = 0.1$, usually for a value of the projection parameter, $\beta \approx 2.0$. This corresponds to a Trotter error of $\approx 10^{-3}$. We have employed $\approx 10^4$ MC sweeps,

allowing 2000 sweeps for equilibration. We have checked for convergence by increasing the value of the projection parameter β , number of MC sweeps and decreasing $\Delta\tau$ and found the above parameters to be satisfactory.

In table 4 we present the ground state energy, energy/site and energy/bond of C_{60} with and without bond alternation. Compared to its fragments, C_{60} has the highest energy/bond at any give value of U/t , indicating that it is the most frustrated of the systems studied. The ground state energy increases with increasing interaction strength but decreases upon introducing bond alternation. We compare the ground state energies obtained from the SPQMC calculations with those from VMC studies in fig. 4 [9, 27]. Since the SPQMC calculations are not variationally bounded caution should be exercised in interpreting the PQMC energies *vis à vis* the VMC energies. However, test calculations on small systems indicate that at intermediate U/t , the absolute SPQMC errors in energies are comparable with or smaller than VMC errors. We shall presently see that the description of the ground state within the SPQMC calculation is better than that afforded by the VMC method.

C_{60} prefers a bond alternating structure in the non-interacting limit since even here the h-h bonds have larger bond orders than the h-p bonds[30, 31]. Using Coulson's relation this translates into shorter h-h distances compared to h-p distances[32, 33]. In table 5 we present the bond orders of uniform and bond alternating C_{60} for different values of the Hubbard parameter. We also compare these values with the VMC bond orders in fig 5. The VMC bond orders show a stronger dependence on U/t . In table 6 we present the

difference in the bond orders of the h-h and the h-p bonds for uniform and bond alternant C_{60} , within VMC and SPQMC schemes. The VMC calculations seem to indicate that interactions suppress this difference. However, the SPQMC bond orders do not fall so sharply with increasing U/t . In one-dimensional Peierls-Hubbard systems, it is known that the difference in bond orders of the 'double' and 'single' bonds goes through a maximum as a function of U/t [34]. It is reasonable to expect a similar behaviour in the case of C_{60} . However, the maximum in this case should shift to larger values of U/t due to increased band width of the bands in higher dimensions. The SPQMC bond order difference registers a downward trend for U/t between 5.0 and 6.0.

We examine the spin-spin correlations on fullerene for different interaction strengths (table 5, fig. 6) and for different inter-site separations (fig. 7) for connectivities shown in the pentagonal projection of C_{60} shown in fig. 3. The h-h spin-spin correlation is strongly antiferromagnetic while the h-p correlation, although *afm*, is weaker. This trend is already manifest even in corannulene, an open system. We observe in fig. 6 the evolution of the nearest neighbour and longer range correlations with increasing U/t . As with the bond orders, increasing interaction strength enhances the difference between the h-h and h-p spin-spin correlations. A Hartree-Fock (HF) calculation on C_{60} predicts an instability in the spin structure of the ground state for $U/t \approx 2.6$ [12]. The evolution of the SPQMC nearest neighbor and longer range correlations with increasing correlation strength is smooth (fig. 6), showing no indication of any instability in the vicinity of $U/t \approx 3.0$. We also study the charge correlations

(table 5 and fig. 8) and find no evidence of any instability in the ground state. Thus, the properties of the ground state tend to evolve smoothly from the non-interacting to the strongly correlated limit.

The SPQMC procedure allows a more detailed analysis of the bond orders and spin-spin correlations, since all the symmetry related estimates are strictly equal. We can construct the *molecular structure factors* (MSF) of C_{60} , similar to the structure factors in crystals, by projecting the quantities such as bond orders and spin correlations on to different irreducible representations of the icosahedral point group. The MSF corresponding to the bond orders for the Γ^{th} irreducible representation, ρ_Γ , is given by

$$\rho_\Gamma = \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\hat{R}} \chi_\Gamma(\hat{R}) \left(\sum_{\sigma} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{\hat{R}i\sigma} + h.c. \right). \quad (36)$$

Similarly the MSF corresponding to the spin correlations S_Γ is given by

$$S_\Gamma = \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\hat{R}} \chi_\Gamma(\hat{R}) \langle s_i^z s_{\hat{R}i}^z \rangle \quad (37)$$

where $\chi_\Gamma(\hat{R})$ is the character of the symmetry operator $\hat{R}$ in the Γ^{th} irreducible representation of the group and $s_i^z s_{\hat{R}i}^z$ is the spin-spin correlation of the z -component of the spins at sites i and $\hat{R}i$.

In fig. 8a and 8b we show the dependence of ρ_Γ on the irreducible representation Γ for uniform and bond alternated fullerenes. Since bond orders are empirically related to the bond distances, these quantities give the amplitude for the nuclear displacement corresponding to the chosen representation Γ . We find that the amplitudes are very small for the A_{1g} and A_{1u} representations.

The former corresponds to a breathing in and out of the fullerene molecule while the latter corresponds to diametrically opposed motions of the nuclei related by the inversion symmetry. The maximum amplitude is for the H_g mode while the amplitudes for the other modes are almost equal in magnitude. This clearly shows that the strongest electron-phonon coupling would be to the H_g mode. Varma *et al*[35] have indeed employed electron-phonon coupling to this mode as a mechanism for superconductivity in fullerides. The effect of increasing the strength of electron correlations is to reduce the amplitude of the H_g mode. Thus, the electron-phonon coupling constant decreases with increase in the Hubbard parameter. Bond alternated C_{60} also shows features very similar to uniform C_{60} .

In fig. 9a and 9b, the dependence of the spin structure factors on the irreducible representation are shown for uniform and bond alternated fullerenes. In both the cases, we find large amplitudes for the T_{2g} and G_u projections. Thus, the spin structure in both the cases are similar and correspond to a mix of these two representations. A geometrical picture of the spin structure with a given Γ can be obtained by placing individual spins, at each site, directed along the site displacement vector for vibrations in that mode[36]. It is interesting to see that the spin MSF has an altogether different structure than the bond MSF. Thus, for instance, the nuclear geometry resulting from application of pressure will be qualitatively different from the spin orientations resulting from the application of a magnetic field. The effect of increase in the strength of electron correlations on the spin structure is complex. While

the amplitudes of the dominant representations increases with increase in U/t , that of a few others decreases and this could be due to an underlying sum rule for the chosen total spin, which in the ground state is a singlet.

5 Summary

We have studied the C_{60} molecule and its molecular fragments using a new, *symmetrized* version of the PQMC method developed by us. In this method all the symmetry related Ising configurations are simultaneously sampled which leads to property estimates that reflect the full symmetry of the system. This method also has the potential to project on to the lowest state in subspaces of different symmetries. We have tested the SPQMC method on small systems. We find a clear improvement in the correlation functions when compared to the nonsymmetrized estimates.

We have applied the SPQMC method to molecular fragments of C_{60} . We find that corannulene, which has a pentagonal unit completely surrounded by ethylenic units is the fragment that resembles C_{60} most closely. The interior sites of corannulenene resemble radialene which is the basic structural motif in C_{60} . We have obtained the SPQMC ground states of C_{60} with and without bond alternation. These have been compared with Hartree-Fock and VMC results. SPQMC bond orders indicate that interactions tend to enhance bond alternation as in the case of one-dimensional Peierls-Hubbard systems. We find no evidence of an instability in the spin structure of C_{60} with increasing corre-

lation strength. We have analyzed the bond orders and spin-spin correlation data in terms of their projections on the space of irreducible representations of the icosahedral point group. These *molecular structure factors* are analogous to the structure factors of translationally invariant systems and give the amplitudes for distortions which transform as the irreducible representations of the point group. The amplitude for the H_g distortion is largest and its magnitude decreases with increasing U/t . Therefore, it is expected that the H_g vibrational mode couples strongly with the electrons in the system for small values of U/t . The spin structure has a bimodal distribution with large weights in the T_{2g} and G_u representations, whose amplitudes increase with increasing U/t .

Acknowledgements: We thank Y. Anusooya for help with the exact computations on small systems and Dr. Biswadeb Dutta for help with the computational facility at JNCASR.

Table 1. Ground state energy of benzene (in units of t) as a function of U/t using exact diagonalization (E_{exact}), GWF as the trial wavefunction in a Gutzwiller variational calculation ($E_{Gutz.}$), VMC and SPQMC calculations. Quantities in parantheses are absolute values of the percentage errors.

U/t	E_{exact}	E_{Gutz}	E_{VMC}	E_{SPQMC}
0.5	-7.274	-7.274 (0.007)	-7.274 (0.007)	-7.278 (0.05)
1.0	-6.601	-6.596 (0.08)	-6.599 (0.03)	-6.611 (0.15)
2.0	-5.410	-5.386 (0.44)	-5.388 (0.41)	-5.444 (0.63)
4.0	-3.669	-3.537 (3.60)	-3.538 (3.57)	-3.783 (3.11)

Table 2(a). Spin-Spin correlations ($4 \langle s_i^z s_j^z \rangle$) of benzene for $U/t = 1.0$ and 4.0, from exact and MC calculations. Quantities in parantheses are absolute values of the percentage errors.

U/t	i, j	$4 \langle s_i^z s_j^z \rangle$			
		<i>Exact</i>	Gutz	VMC	SPQMC
1.0	1,1	0.567	0.565 (0.35)	0.557 (1.76)	0.562 (0.88)
1.0	1,2	-0.267	-0.265 (0.75)	-0.245 (8.24)	-0.264 (1.12)
1.0	1,3	0.022	0.016 (27.3)	0.011 (50.0)	0.020 (9.10)
1.0	1,4	-0.077	-0.068 (11.7)	-0.062 (19.5)	-0.074 (3.90)
4.0	1,1	0.778	0.751 (3.47)	0.750 (3.60)	0.751 (3.47)
4.0	1,2	-0.435	-0.404 (7.13)	-0.395 (9.20)	-0.412 (5.29)
4.0	1,3	0.140	0.095 (32.1)	0.077 (45.0)	0.120 (14.0)
4.0	1,4	-0.188	-0.131 (30.3)	-0.113 (39.9)	-0.167 (11.2)

Table 2(b). Charge–Charge correlations ($\langle n_i n_j \rangle$) of benzene for $U/t = 1.0$ and 4.0, from exact and MC calculations. Quantities in parantheses are the absolute values of the percentage errors.

U/t	i, j	$\langle n_i n_j \rangle$			
		<i>Exact</i>	Gutz	VMC	SPQMC
1.0	1,1	1.432	1.435 (0.21)	1.443 (0.77)	1.436 (0.28)
1.0	1,2	0.816	0.817 (0.12)	0.812 (0.49)	0.813 (0.37)
1.0	1,3	0.989	0.989 (0.05)	0.976 (1.31)	0.989 (0.05)
1.0	1,4	0.960	0.953 (0.73)	0.952 (0.83)	0.958 (0.21)
4.0	1,1	1.222	1.249 (2.21)	1.250 (2.29)	1.250 (2.29)
4.0	1,2	0.905	0.911 (0.66)	0.911 (0.66)	0.896 (0.99)
4.0	1,3	0.990	0.979 (1.11)	0.979 (1.11)	0.987 (0.30)
4.0	1,4	0.989	0.971 (1.82)	0.971 (1.82)	0.985 (0.40)

Table 3. Ground state energies of pyracylene, fluoranthene and corannulene (in units of t) from VMC and PQMC calculations.

U/t	Pyracylene		Fluoranthene		Corannulene	
	E_{VMC}	E_{PQMC}	E_{VMC}	E_{PQMC}	E_{VMC}	E_{PQMC}
0.5	-17.713	-17.725	-20.558	-20.565	-26.3058	-26.317
1.0	-16.116*	-16.158	-18.730	-18.771	-24.007	-24.062
2.0	-13.235	-13.406	-15.422	-15.581	-19.8474	-20.037
4.0	-8.666	-9.434	-10.164	-10.892	-13.158	-14.063

* exact energy obtained from full CI calculation in the singlet subspace of dimension 2760615 is -16.13

Table 4. Ground state energy of uniform and bond alternant C_{60} for various values of U from SPQMC calculations.

U/t	uniform			bond alternant		
	E	$E/site$	$E/bond$	E	$E/site$	$E/bond$
1.0	-79.0307	-1.317	-0.878	-81.5973	-1.360	-0.907
2.0	-66.6284	-1.110	-0.740	-69.2986	-1.155	-0.770
3.0	-56.0459	-0.934	-0.623	-58.8326	-0.981	-0.654
4.0	-47.3407	-0.789	-0.526	-50.2902	-0.836	-0.559
5.0	-40.4724	-0.675	-0.450	-43.5544	-0.726	-0.484
6.0	-35.6031	-0.593	-0.396	-38.4948	-0.642	-0.428

Table 5. On-site and nearest neighbour SPQMC charge-charge correlations ($\langle n_i n_j \rangle$) and spin-spin correlations ($4 \langle s_i^z s_j^z \rangle$) and bond orders of uniform and bond alternant C_{60} for different values of U/t .

U		uniform			bond alternant		
		h-h	h-p	diag	h-h	h-p	diag
1.0	bo	0.598	0.472	—	0.708	0.408	—
	s-s	-0.212	-0.130	0.549	-0.294	-0.097	0.550
	c-c	0.846	0.902	1.450	0.783	0.926	1.449
2.0	bo	0.589	0.461	—	0.700	0.396	—
	s-s	-0.249	-0.148	0.559	-0.345	-0.109	0.603
	c-c	0.869	0.915	1.401	0.814	0.937	1.397
3.0	bo	0.575	0.442	—	0.687	0.374	—
	s-s	-0.294	-0.168	0.650	-0.406	-0.121	0.655
	c-c	0.888	0.928	1.350	0.840	0.947	1.345
4.0	bo	0.554	0.415	—	0.667	0.345	—
	s-s	-0.350	-0.192	0.702	-0.473	-0.135	0.708
	c-c	0.905	0.939	1.298	0.863	0.912	1.292

Table 6. Difference in the bond orders of the h-h and h-p bonds of C_{60} from VMC and SPQMC calculations.

U/t	uniform		bond alternant	
	VMC	SPQMC	VMC	SPQMC
1.0	0.126	0.126	0.482	0.300
2.0	0.121	0.128	0.486	0.304
3.0	0.121	0.133	0.436	0.313
4.0	0.112	0.139	0.379	0.322

References

- [1] H. W. Kroto, J. R. Heath, S. C. O'Brien, R. F. Curl and R. E. Smalley, Nature **318**, 162 (1985).
- [2] W. Kratschmer, L. D. Lamb, L. K. Fostiropoulos and D. R. Huffman, Nature **347**, 354 (1990).
- [3] C. S. Yannoni, R. D. Johnson, G. Meijer, D. S. Bethune and J. R. Salem, J. Phys. Chem. **95**, 9 (1991); R. Tycko, R. C. Haddon, G. Dubbagh, D. C. Douglass, A. M. Mujsce, J. Phys. Chem. **95**, 518 (1991).
- [4] R. M. Fleming, A. P. Ramirez, M. J. Rosseinsky, D. W. Murphy, R. C. Haddon, S. M. Zahurak and A. V. Makhija, Nature **352**, 787 (1991).
- [5] P. Allemand, K. C. Khemani, A. Koch, F. Wudl, K. Holczer, S. Donovan, G. Gruner and J. E. Thompson, Science **253**, 301 (1991).
- [6] P. W. Stephens, D. Cox, J. W. Lauher, L. Mihaly, J. B. Wiley, P. M. Allemand, A. Hisch, K. Holczer, Q. Li, J. D. Thompson and F. Wudl, Nature **355**, 331 (1992).
- [7] S. Chakravorthy, M. P. Gelfand and S. Kivelson, Science **254**, 970 (1991).
- [8] S. L. Sondhi, M. P. Gelfand, H. Q. Lin and D. K. Campbell, Phys. Rev. **B** **51**, 5943 (1995).

- [9] V. Ya Krivnov, I. L. Shamovsky, E. E. Tornau and A. Rosengren, Phys. Rev. **B 50**, 12144 (1994).
- [10] M. C. Gutzwiller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 159 (1963); Phys. Rev. **134**, A993 (1964); *ibid.* **137**, A1726 (1965).
- [11] D. Coffey and S. A. Trugman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 176 (1992).
- [12] L. Bergomi, J. P. Blaizot, Th. Jolicœur and E. Dagotto, Phys. Rev. **B 47**, 5539 (1993).
- [13] J. M. Schulman, R. L. Disch, M. A. Miller and R. C. Peck, Chem. Phys. Lett. **141**, 45 (1987).
- [14] D. Bakowies and W. Thiel, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **113**, 3704 (1991).
- [15] S. Sathpathy, Chem. Phys. Lett. **130**, 545 (1986).
- [16] Bhargavi Srinivasan and S. Ramasesha, Solid State Commun. **81**, 831 (1992).
- [17] Aparna Chakrabarti, Y. Anusooya and S. Ramasesha, J. Mol. Struct. Theochem. (in press).
- [18] S. R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2863 (1992); Phys. Rev. **B 48**, 10345 (1993).
- [19] H. Yokoyama and H. Shiba, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **56**, 1490 (1987).

- [20] J. E. Hirsch, Phys. Rev. **28**, 4059 (1983).
- [21] S. Sorella, E. Tosatti, S. Baroni, R. Car and M. Parrinello, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **B 1**, 993 (1988).
- [22] S. R. White, D. J. Scalapino, R. L. Sugar, E. Y. Loh, J. E. Gubernatis and R. T. Scalettar, Phys. Rev. **B 40**, 506 (1989).
- [23] M. Imada and Y. Hatsugai, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **58**, 3752 (1989).
- [24] J. Hubbard, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. **238**, A276 (1964); *ibid.* **237**, A277 (1964); *ibid.*, **401**, A281 (1964).
- [25] W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling and B. P. Flannery, Numerical Recipes, Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- [26] Bhargavi Srinivasan and S. Ramasesha (unpublished results).
- [27] Bhargavi Srinivasan, S. Ramasesha and H. R. Krishnamurthy, submitted to J. Phys. Chem.
- [28] T. A. Kaplan, P. Horsch and P. Fulde, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 889 (1989).
- [29] Z. G. Soos, P. C. M. McWilliams and G. W. Hayden, Chem. Phys. Lett. **171**, 14 (1990).
- [30] W. I. F. David, R. M. Ibberson, J. C. Matthewman, K. Prassides, T. J. S. Denis, J. P. Hare, H. W. Kroto, R. Taylor and D. R. M. Walton, Nature **353**, 147 (1991).

- [31] K. Hedberg, L. Hedberg, D. S. Bethune, C. A. Brown, H. C. Dorn, R. D. Johnson and M. de Vries, *Science* **254**, 410 (1991).
- [32] C. A. Coulson, *Proc. Royal Soc.* **A169**, 413 (1939).
- [33] C. A. Coulson and R. B. Mallion, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **98**, 592 (1976).
- [34] Z. G. Soos and S. Ramasesha, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 2374 (1983).
- [35] C. M. Varma, J. Zaanen and K. Raghavachari, *Science* **254**, 989 (1991).
- [36] D. E. Weeks and W. G. Harter, *J. Chem. Phys.* **90**, 4744 (1989).

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Sample Ising configurations (a) and (b) for the 4-site Hubbard ring with 4 time slices which are related by C_4 symmetry.

Figure 2. Structures of (a) Pyracylene, (b) Fluoranthene and (c) Corannulene.

Figure 3. (a) Structure of Radialene and (b) Pentagonal projection of C_{60} .

Figure 4. Energy/site of (a) uniform and (b) bond alternated C_{60} for various values of U/t . Open circles represent SPQMC data while crosses are from the VMC calculation.

Figure 5. Bond orders for the h-h and h-p bonds from SPQMC calculations (crosses and open triangles) and VMC calculations (open squares and open circles) for (a) uniform and (b) bond alternated C_{60} for various values of U/t .

Figure 6. Inter-site spin-spin correlations of (a) uniform and (b) bond alternant C_{60} for 1-2 (filled squares), 1-11 (open circles), 1-3 (asterisks), 1-6 (crosses) and 1-7 (open triangles) site connectivities, for different values of U/t .

Figure 7. Inter-site charge-charge correlations of (a) uniform and (b) bond alternant C_{60} for 1-2 (open squares), 1-11 (open circles), 1-3 (asterisks), 1-6 (crosses) and 1-7 (open triangles) site connectivities, for different values of U/t .

Figure 8. ρ_{Γ} for (a) uniform and (b) bond alternant C_{60} for the irreducible representations of the icosahedral point group, for $U/t = 1.0$ (asterisks), $U/t = 2.0$ (open circles), $U/t = 3.0$ (triangles), $U/t = 4.0$ (crosses), $U/t = 5.0$ (inverted triangles) and $U/t = 6.0$ (open squares).

Figure 9. S_{Γ} for (a) uniform and (b) bond alternant C_{60} for the irreducible representations of the icosahedral point group, for $U/t = 1.0$ (asterisks), $U/t = 2.0$ (open circles), $U/t = 3.0$ (triangles), $U/t = 4.0$ (crosses), $U/t = 5.0$ (inverted triangles) and $U/t = 6.0$ (open squares).